

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,464	03/03/2006	Yves Mayeresse	B45326	1405
20462 7590 02/14/2007 SMITHKLINE BEECHAM CORPORATION CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY-US, UW2220			EXAMINER	
			BLUMEL, BENJAMIN P	
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	P. O. BOX 1539 KING OF PRUSSIA, PA 19406-0939			PAPER NUMBER
	,		1648	
		•		_
SHORTENED STATUTORY PE	RIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
31 DAYS 02/14/2007		DAE	DED	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
•	10/533,464	MAYERESSE ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Benjamin P. Blumel	1648
The MAILING DATE of this communication a eriod for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stated and the period for reply will, by stated for the period for the period for reply will, by stated for the period for reply will, by stated for the period for reply will, by stated for the period for th	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT tute, cause the application to become ABA	CATION. ply be timely filed I'HS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
atus		•
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) To This action is FINAL. 3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under the second se	his action is non-final. vance except for formal matte	
isposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-32 are subject to restriction and/or	rawn from consideration.	
pplication Papers		•
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) and a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the correction o	ccepted or b) objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyand ection is required if the drawing(ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume * See the attached detailed Office action for a light	ents have been received. ents have been received in Apriority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage
ttachment(s)		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date iformal Patent Application

5

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-15 and 20-24, drawn to an immunogenic composition.

Group II, claim(s) 16-19, drawn to a method of making a vaccine.

Group III, claim(s) 25-32, drawn to a method of preserving a vaccine.

The inventions of Groups I-III lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Truong-Le, V. (US 7,135,180 B2) and (Kurikka et al., The Journal of Pediatrics, 1996). The claimed inventions are drawn to an immunogenic composition of bacterial saccharides, inactivated poliovirus and a stabilizing agent; a method of making the immunogenic composition and a method of preserving the immunogenic composition. However (Truong-Le, V.) is drawn to methods of preserving viruses, bacteria, vaccines, nucleic acids, antibodies, etc. with stabilizing agents such as sugars in a foam based agent. Even though Truong-Le does not teach the specific combination of an inactivated poliovirus and bacterial polysaccharides in a dry composition, the teachings of Kurikka et al. focus on vaccination with multiple antigens of Hib, IPV, PRP-D, PRP-T and DTP. In particular, PRP-T contained lyophilized tetanus toxoid and

Haemophilus influenzae b polysaccharide. Therefore, one in the art would be motivated to combine multiple antigens into one lyophilized vaccine composition in light of the teachings and Truong-Le and Kurikka et al. Therefore groups I-III do not share a special technical feature as defined by PCT Rule 13.2. Note that PCT Rule 13 does not provide for multiple products or methods within a single application.

Page 3

Election of Species

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

- A. A specific capsular saccharide antigen as stated in claims 2 and 6
- **B.** A specific *N. meningitides* as stated in claim 7 and 32.
- C. A specific characteristic of the dried composition as stated in claims 11-14.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the

Art Unit: 1648

limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

A. Claims 2 and 6, 8 and 9 require a capsular saccharide antigen, all other claims are generic.

B. Claims 7 and 32 require a specific *N. meningitides*, all other claims are generic.

C. Claims 11-14 require a specific characteristic, all other claims are generic.

The following claim(s) are generic with regard to A, B and C: 1, 3-5, 10 and 15-31.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: the prior art would motivate one in the art to preserve the prepared pathogen vaccine into a common lyophilized specimen as described above.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103 (a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 1648

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin P. Blumel whose telephone number is 571-272-4960. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell can be reached on 571-272-1600. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Benjamin Blumel Patent Examiner

> BRUCE R. CAMPELL, PH.D SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600